

WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

COMMITTEE: PUBLIC WORKS - *SOLID WASTE & RECYCLING*

DATE: JANUARY 31, 2013

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUPERVISORS BENTLEY
MERLINO
CONOVER
WOOD
TAYLOR
FRASIER
DICKINSON
MASON

OTHERS PRESENT:

JEFFERY TENNYSON, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC WORKS
JULIE PACYNA, PURCHASING AGENT
KEVIN B. GERAGHTY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD
PAUL DUSEK, COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR
MARTIN AUFFREDOU, COUNTY ATTORNEY
JOAN SADY, CLERK OF THE BOARD
FRANK THOMAS, BUDGET OFFICER
SUPERVISORS KENNY
STRAINER
VANSELOW
WESTCOTT
KATE JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, TOURISM DEPARTMENT
MIKE SWAN, WARREN COUNTY TREASURER
DON LEHMAN, *THE POST STAR*
AMANDA ALLEN, SR. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE SPECIALIST

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

SUPERVISOR MONTESI

Mr. Bentley called the meeting of the Public Works Committee to order at 9:04 a.m.

Privilege of the floor was extended to Jeffery Tennyson, Superintendent of Public Works, who distributed copies of the meeting agenda to the Committee members; *a copy of same is on file with the minutes*. Mr. Tennyson advised the purpose of the meeting was to review the solid waste hauling and disposal bids received, copies of which were included in the agenda packet. He noted that Julie Pacyna, Purchasing Agent, was in attendance to assist with the document review.

Ms. Pacyna pointed out that the information provided in the agenda packet included several documents, the first being the Bid Request/Specification; followed by the Bid Tabulation Sheets listing the bids received; the WC 65-12 Rebate Formulas; and finally, a summarized document listing the costs projected for each town "Without Provision of Containers". Referring to the Bid Tabulation Sheets provided, Ms. Pacyna advised bids for solid waste and recycling disposal services had been received from five companies, which she enumerated as follows:

1. Waste Management of New York, LLC;
2. Casella Waste Management, Inc.;
3. Capital Region Landfill, Inc.;
4. D&G Recycling, LLC; and
5. Perkins Recycling Corporation.

As for the solid waste and recyclable transportation services, Ms. Pacyna advised there had only been two bidders, Waste Management of New York, LLC and Casella Waste Management, Inc. A review of the aforementioned documents ensued.

Chairman Geraghty questioned what the "Without Provision of Containers" notation signified and Ms. Pacyna replied that the solid waste and recyclable transportation services bid documents had allowed for companies to submit bids based on use of their own storage containers for waste collection and for use of the County's storage containers; however, she noted, neither of the responders had submitted a bid based on use of their own containers. Ms. Pacyna concluded that she had labeled the report "Without Provision of Containers" to indicate that the quotes were based on the use of the County-owned containers.

Mr. Taylor noted that the documents provided did not include anticipated costs for solid waste services for the City of Glens Falls and Ms. Pacyna responded this was because the City had chosen not to participate in the bid process during the prior year when the solid waste disposal contracts were initially established.

Extensive discussion ensued with respect to the bid documents, during which it was noted that the purpose of the bid process, which provided costs for disposal of several different waste types through various disposal scenarios, was to supply a number of options so that each municipality could choose the most cost effective option available to them.

Martin Auffredou, County Attorney, advised in accordance with the Purchasing Policy, each municipality would have to determine the lowest responsible bidder for the services they desired, requiring an individual contract with the company providing them. He said the number of contracts created by this process would require a herculean effort by his staff, which they would undertake if the Committee desired that they do so. Because the solid waste contracts were of no real value to the County and were being considered in order to provide the best possible pricing for each individual municipality, Mr. Auffredou suggested that an alternate approach might be to allow each town to administer the contracts themselves, according to the services required. He said that an aggregate approach to the bid selections could also be taken, choosing the best overall pricing for all of the towns combined and securing contracts for multiple municipalities. Mr. Dickinson indicated that he was not sure relegating the contract process to the individual towns was the best option as contractual issues could be better dealt with at the County level. Mr. Auffredou conceded this was a valid point and agreed that in the significant amount of time his Office had spent working on the contracts secured for the prior year, his staff had developed an expertise in dealing with the contractors which might not be translated to the staff of each individual town.

Mr. Conover recalled that the purpose of the County taking the initiative to seek out solid waste bids in this manner was to secure the best disposal and hauling rates available based on the participation of several municipalities and he noted that if each municipality were to secure separate contracts the group pricing might not hold true. Ms. Pacyna responded that the pricing indicated would remain consistent regardless of whether the contract was secured for all municipalities or just one. Additionally, she noted that during the bid opening process, certain bidders had expressed frustration regarding the manner in which the bid process was addressed, indicating that no cost savings were being attained as the total waste volumes provided were not very large in comparison to collections made from other customers. Ms. Pacyna stated that it was the decision of each municipality whether or not to participate in the solid waste bids, as well as which waste items they wished to contract for.

Mr. Bentley said he was not in favor of an aggregate contract, stating that the only way to save money was for each municipality to choose the services that were best priced for their area. He noted that while certain waste aspects had received similar disposal pricing, others varied greatly. For instance, Mr. Bentley referred to the Town of Horicon Without Provision of Containers sheet pointing out that for newspaper, the quote for disposal by Waste Management to Wheelabrator & Wing Street reflected a \$171.06 rebate, while the quote for disposal by Casella to Hiram Hollow listed a cost of \$83.00. He concluded that if each town did not select their services individually, they would be losing money. Mrs. Wood agreed with Mr. Bentley, stating that she preferred to make the determinations at the town level and administer the contracts there, as well, in order to save money and provide a better line of communication with the contractor directly, while alleviating the contract responsibilities from County staff.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Dickinson questioned whether they would have additional time to ponder the information provided before making a decision and Mr. Tennyson responded affirmatively. Mr. Auffredou cautioned that

a decision would need to be made in the near future and a second meeting held before the February 15th Board meeting as the current disposal and hauling contracts would expire in February and March.

Mr. Tennyson advised the next agenda item pertained to discussion on the County-owned waste containers. He said that currently, the containers owned by the County were dispersed amongst the municipalities participating in the solid waste plan and they were picked up by the various hauling contractors. Mr. Tennyson noted that this process had led to the containers being interspersed with the inventory of the hauling company making the inventory process required by the County Treasurer's Office almost impossible for his staff to maintain. He explained it was a difficult process to account for the containers, requiring his staff to travel to multiple locations to look for the containers, some of which were actually disposed of as they became unserviceable. Mr. Tennyson advised that if they continued to use this process, they were likely to continue to lose track of the containers and that was why they had requested disposal bids that would include the use of the haulers containers. He commented that he had been very surprised to learn that neither of the companies had submitted bids which included the use of their own shipping containers. Mr. Tennyson apprised that in the past, the County budget had included funding for repair and replacement of shipping containers; however, he added, those line items had been removed and there was no longer any funding for these expenses. He concluded that if the County wished to continue to maintain their shipping container inventory, funding would need to be provided to do so.

Mr. Merlino suggested that another option available would be to transfer the containers to the individual towns for their use and maintenance, alleviating the County of that responsibility. Mr. Tennyson agreed that this was a viable suggestion and he noted that there were approximately 40 containers not currently being used which could be gathered up and auctioned off, as well. Mr. Bentley pointed out that the unused containers could be distributed amongst the towns to use in instances when empty containers were not available from the hauler to avoid additional hauling costs that would be incurred by having to remove a full container, empty and return it.

A brief discussion ensued.

Mr. Tennyson noted Mr. Auffredou's prior indication that the current solid waste and hauling bids were set to expire in the upcoming months and he questioned when the Committee would like to meet again to further address this issue. It was the consensus of the Committee that a second meeting should be scheduled on either February 13th or 14th to continue discussions and make a decision on the matter.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion made by Mrs. Frasier and seconded by Mr. Dickinson, Mr. Bentley adjourned the meeting at 10:08 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Allen, Deputy Clerk of the Board